

2:99-0107

In the Eighty-Eight U. S. District Courts of the Fifty States of the United States of America

Donald S. Drusky, Petitioner.
The People of the Fifty States
of the United States of America,
Plaintiffs,

v.

The 100th U. S. Congress thru 105th
Congress, and the Governor, Lt.
Governor and Legislature of the
Fifty States,
Defendants.

One

Civil and Criminal Action

File Number

FILED

FEB 10 1999

SAMUEL L. KAY, CLERK
U. S. District
So.

Donald S. Drusky and All the
People of the Fifty States of
the United States of America,
Complainants,

v.

U.S.X Corporation and United
Steelworkers of America,
Defendants.

Two

Donald S. Drusky and All the
People of the Fifty States of the
United States of America,
Complainants,

v.

George Bush, All the Individual
Members of the U. S. Senate and
U. S. House of Representatives of the
100th U. S. Congress, and Edwin
Meese, and the Governors and
State Attorneys General, as
Individuals, of the Fifty States of
the United States of America, as of
June 1986,
Defendants.

Three

Donald S. Drusky and All the
People of the Fifty States of the
United States of America,
Plaintiffs,

v.

U. S. Attorney General Janet
Reno and the U. S. Attorneys
for Each U. S. District Court
of the Eighty-Eight U. S. District
Courts of the United States of America,
Defendants.

Four

Donald S. Drusky and All the
People of the Fifty States of the
United States of America,
Plaintiffs,

v.

Federal Communications
Commission, Defendant, with
American Broadcasting Company,
Columbia Broadcasting Company,
National Broadcasting Company,
Fox Broadcasting Company and
Cable News Network, as Necessary
or Indispensable Parties.

Five

Donald S. Drusky, Petitioner,

v.

The Sovereign People of the
United States of America,
Defendants.

Six

Donald S. Drusky, Plaintiff,

v.

God,
Defendant.

Seven

To the Honorable, the Judges of the Eighty-Eight U. S. District Courts of the Fifty States of the United States of America:

Section One. - The Case of Donald S. Drusky, Petitioner. The People of the Fifty States of the United States of America, Plaintiffs, v. The 100th Congress thru the 105th Congress, and the Governor, Lt. Governor and Legislature of the Fifty States, Defendants. - Petition for removal from office all the remaining members of the 100th Congress thru the 105th Congress. Petition to remove from office the Governor, Lt. Governor and entire Legislature of each state (bicameral or unicameral) in office as of the present date, that were in office during 1998.

Reason for Removal From Office: Willful failure to redress grievances at the federal and state levels of government. They love your vote and love your tax money. They do not love you or care about you. They can't stand your grievances and will not redress your meritorious grievances under your Amendment One rights. Petitioner Donald S. Drusky is the only one that loves you, and I am sincerely concerned about you. They are incapable of good government and must be removed for bad government.

The Legal Setting: The People of the Fifty States of the United States of America, as Plaintiffs in this action, invoke U. S. C. A. 28, Section 1331 to gain jurisdiction over federal and state officials, that were elected into office by the people, and are subject to removal from office by the people for violation of Amendment One, right to redress. The people of the 50 states voted into office their respective members of the U. S. Congress and State Government, and are responsible, respectively, for the removal of their elected officials of federal and state government. At Note 3 on page 563 under Gordon v. Leatherman 450 F.2d, 562 (1971), it reads as follows: "Insofar as the United States Constitution is concerned, an elector may vote for a good reason, a bad reason, or for no reason whatsoever, and such principle applies to recall elections as it does to all other elections. U. S. C. A. Constitutional Amendment 14."

Claim of Relief Sought: The people ^{seek} possible removal by Court or, in the alternative, by recall vote.

The Factual Setting: Part One - The Case of the 100th U. S. Congress thru the 105th U. S. Congress. Petitioner Donald S. Drusky submitted an eight page petition dated August 14, 1987 with supporting exhibits to the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Within the petition, a motion was made to enjoin, amongst others, the U. S. Senate and U. S. House of Representatives as Defendants. It required Plaintiff Donald S. Drusky to serve process upon all 100 U. S. Senators and all 435 U. S. Representatives. The petition was reduced in size and fitted onto one page front to back. A series of exhibits were also reduced in size and fitted onto two pages front to back. A copy of the reduced in size petition and two pages of reduced in size exhibits are attached as an exhibit to this petition in the 88 U. S. District Courts. Donald S. Drusky did serve process upon all 100 U. S. Senators and upon almost all the 435 U. S. Representatives. At the time of service of process, certain names were not available. Within the motion to enjoin Congress as Defendants, Plaintiff Donald S. Drusky sought a legislative redress of grievances and a special court to properly process civil and criminal complaints against the U S X Corporation and the United Steelworkers of America. Congress failed to redress my grievances, failed to create a Special Court, and did not create a Special "United States Committee for the Redress of Grievances." In essence, the people of the 50 states (election after election) voted Congress the power to not legislatively redress grievances. Meanwhile, the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia did not docket or process the prima-facie petition. The U. S. District Court improperly returned the petition to Donald S. Drusky with a covering letter dated August 24, 1987 by Deputy Clerk A. J. Rambow. A copy of the letter is attached as an exhibit. The 100th Congress, in essence, countenanced the inaction of the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

The Factual Setting: Part Two - The Case of the Governor, Lt. Governor and Legislature of the Fifty States. Petitioner Donald S. Drusky submitted an eight page petition dated August 14, 1987 with supporting exhibits to the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia. On Exhibit 'A' attached to the petition is a view of a reduced in size 4 page petition dated June 28, 1986 to the U. S. Supreme Court that Donald S. Drusky neatly and accurately drafted on behalf of himself and on behalf of all the citizens of the United States of America. Part 1 of the Complaint reads as follows: "I bring this suit on my behalf and on behalf of all the citizens of America." The Certificate of Service was made on the bottom of the 4th page. It read: "On the 28th day of June 1986, I served a copy of this complaint by first class mail to the Governors and Attorney Generals of the 50 States of America, and to the Solicitor General and to the National Labor Relations Board." The Complaint was respectfully submitted by Donald S. Drusky. By letter dated July 1, 1986, Assistant Clerk Edward C. Schade of the U. S. Supreme Court improperly

returned the valid petition. A reduced in size copy of the letter is viewed on Exhibit 'A'. The Governors and Attorney Generals of the Fifty States of the United States of America, in essence, countenanced the inaction of the U. S. Supreme Court. The Defendants could not possibly or truly rebut the complaint against the 50 states for their failure to redress grievances under Amendment One at the state level of government. The 50 state governments do not have a "Committee for the Redress of Grievances" to work in conjunction with the "People's Right to Petition for Redress."

Conclusion of Part One and Part Two of the Factual Setting: Congress and the 50 State Legislatures cannot produce verified records to prove the legislative redress of the day-to-day grievances of the people. No records are available in law libraries or public libraries. The day-to-day grievances of the people are not being redressed by officials at the federal and state levels of government, and they are subject to removal from office by their respective electors. The right of recall is a fundamental right of the people in a representative democracy.

Section Two - The Case of Donald S. Drusky and All the People of the Fifty States of the United States of America, Complainants, v. U S X Corporation and United Steelworkers of America, Defendants.

The Legal Setting: Criminal Complaint for Violation of U. S. C. A. 18, Section 1503 - Influencing or injuring officer, juror or witness generally; and U. S. C. A. 18, Section 371 - Conspiracy to commit offence or defraud the United States; and U. S. C. A. 18, Section 241 - Conspiracy against rights of Citizens.

The Factual Setting: Part One - The Complainants state that a petition on exhibit dated August 14, 1987 was submitted to the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Defendants U S X Corporation and United Steelworkers of America jointly forced the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia to not docket or process the meritorious petition neatly and accurately drafted by Donald S. Drusky to bring the company and union to civil and criminal justice. The petition sought the redress of Donald S. Drusky's grievances and all the people of America, as their grievances arise under Amendment One of the U. S. Constitution. A valid motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis was made with supporting affidavit. On exhibit is a copy of a letter dated August 24, 1987 by Deputy Clerk A. J. Ramlow improperly returning the petition to Donald S. Drusky. The valid petition and certificate of service were also supported by affidavit.

The Factual Setting: Part Two - The Complainants state that on Exhibit 'A', attached to the August 14, 1987 petition to the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia, is a view of a reduced in size 4 page petition dated June 28, 1986 to the U. S. Supreme Court, that was neatly and accurately drafted by Donald S. Drusky on behalf of himself and on behalf of all the citizens of America. A valid motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and certificate of service were supported by affidavit. The body of the 4 page petition to the U. S. Supreme Court does not refer to the U S X Corporation or the United Steelworkers of America. However, as it would eventually affect the company and union, they jointly intervened in the action by forcing the U. S. Supreme Court to not docket or process the valid petition. By letter dated July 1, 1986, Assistant Clerk Edward C. Schade of the U. S. Supreme Court improperly returned the valid petition to Donald S. Drusky. A copy of the reduced in size letter is viewed on Exhibit 'A'.

The Factual Setting: Part Three - The Complainants state that on Exhibit 'AA', attached to the August 14, 1987 petition to the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia, is a view of a reduced in size 4 page 'Opinion' by Senior District Judge Wallace Howley of the U. S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. The caption on the Civil Action read: "Donald S. Drusky, Plaintiff, v. The Judges of the Supreme Court, Eleven U. S. Circuit Courts of Appeals and Eighty-Nine U. S. District Courts Embracing the Fifty States of the United States of America, and District of Columbia, and the United States Steel Corporation, and J. W. Abel, Joseph Molony and Walter Burke of the United Steelworkers of America, and the National Labor Relations Board, Defendants." The case was docketed as Civil Action Number 71-249. The 'Opinion' was concluded with an 'Order' which read: "Now this 16 day of March 1971, It Is Ordered that leave to proceed in forma pauperis be and the same is hereby denied and the Complaint is dismissed." This particular case was docketed with an opinion and concluding order. However, in this case, Defendants United States Steel Corporation (now known as the U S X Corporation) and the United Steelworkers of America caused the court to issue a decision, which withheld justice.

Section Three - The Case of Donald S. Drusky and All the People of the Fifty States of the United States of America, Complainants, v. George Bush, All the Individual Members of the U. S. Senate and U. S. House of Representatives of the 100th Congress, and Edwin Meese, and the Governors and State Attorney Generals, as Individuals, of the Fifty States of the United States of America, as of June 1986, Defendants.

The Legal Setting: Criminal Complaint for Violation of U. S. C. A. 18, Section 3. Accessory after the fact; and U. S. C. A. 18, Section 4. Misprision of felony.

The Factual Setting: Part One - The Complainants state that this Complaint against the federal Defendants of Section Three is based on the Factual Setting - Part One and Part Two of Section One of this petition, and derived from the Legal Setting and the Factual Setting - Part One and Part Two and Part Three of Section Two of this petition. Additionally, on page 6 of the petition on exhibit to the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia, a motion was made to enjoin U. S. Attorney General Edwin Meese as a Defendant. Donald S. Drusky served process upon Edwin Meese. From the time that U. S. Steel and the United Steelworkers of America jointly committed perjury in Civil Action 68-124 to illegally and criminally obtain Summary Judgment against Donald S. Drusky, they jointly barred the U. S. Attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania and the U. S. Attorney General and the U. S. Department of Justice to not initiate criminal proceedings against them. U. S. Attorney General E. Meese continued the trend. Part One Defendants are George Bush, Edwin Meese & Individuals of Congress.

The Factual Setting: Part Two - The Complainants state that this Complaint against the Governors and State Attorney Generals, as Individuals, of the Fifty States of the United States of America, as of June 1986, is based upon the Factual - Part Two of Section One of this petition, and derived from the Legal and Factual - Part Two of Section Two of this petition.

Conclusion of Section Three: The Defendants of Part One of the Factual Setting made no formal investigation of the inaction of the U. S. District for the District of Columbia. The Defendants of Part Two of the Factual Setting made no formal investigation of the inaction of the U. S. Supreme Court. The Defendants of Part One and Part Two of the Factual Setting took advantage of the inaction of the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia and U. S. Supreme Court, respectively. Defendants Bush, Meese and Individuals of the 100th Congress could not truly rebut the valid complaint against them, and did not take any positive action to maintain the felons responsible for the inaction of the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The Governors and State Attorney Generals of the Fifty States could not truly rebut the valid complaint against their respective state. They covered up for their respective state and took no positive action to maintain the felons responsible for the inaction of the U. S. Supreme Court. Instead, the felons have barbarously disenfranchised Donald S. Drusky. Defendants Bush, Meese and Individuals of the 100th Congress had full knowledge of felonies committed by the U. S. X Corporation and the United Steelworkers of America. To save face and avoid disgrace, no affirmative action was made to create a special court to properly prosecute the company and union.

A definition of 'misprision of felony' under U. S. C. A. 18, Section 4 is as follows: A "misprision of felony" is the concealment of a felony without giving any degree of maintenance to the felon. The law citation is U. S. v. Perlstein, 126 F.2d 789. The law under U. S. C. A. 18, Section 3. 'Accessory after the fact' reads as follows: Whoever, knowing that an offense against the United States has been committed, receives, relieves, comforts or assists the offender in order to hinder or prevent his apprehension, trial or punishment, is an accessory after the fact. An accessory after the fact to a crime is an offense principally tending to evade the public justice and is subsequent in its commencement to the crime of aiding and abetting. - U. S. v. Anthony, D. C. Pa. 1956, 145 F. Supp. 323. Regarding all the Defendants of Section Three: Conviction of the principal offender is not a necessary condition precedent to conviction of an accessory after the fact. - U. S. v. Walker (1969, CA9 Cal) 415 F.2d 530. The right to petition the government for the redress of grievances includes the right of access to the courts; that right is also subject to due process protection in that the opportunity must be at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner. - U. S. C. A. Constitutional Amendments 1 and 5. - Matter of N. C. Trading, Cust. & Pat. App. 1978, 586 F.2d 221. Right of petition guarantees all citizens right to appeal to the legislature or judiciary and this right is not conditioned upon motive. - Helmerite, Inc. v. Eagan Real Estate, Inc. D. C. N. Y. 1977, 454 F. Supp. 1124.

Within the petition to the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia, a request was made for a special court to properly process civil and criminal complaints against the USX Corporation and the United Steelworkers of America. Simultaneously, the 100th Congress denied a special court and the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia denied access to their court. The matter was further compounded because the 100th Congress would not grant funds toward Donald S. Drusky's pursuit of justice, which economically coerced Donald S. Drusky. The denial of public funds obstructed justice and clarified the crimes of misprision of felony and accessory after the fact. The despicable offenses by the collective Defendants of Section Three severely compounded the legal disability and medical disability of Donald S. Drusky, which severely disenfranchised Donald S. Drusky. Under the petition to the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Donald S. Drusky was to be restored but was destroyed. The crimes by the USX Corporation and the United Steelworkers of America have been known for years. Donald S. Drusky has petitioned public officials at all levels of government for years, that have compounded the crimes of the company and union. The petition on exhibit dated August 14, 1987 to the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia was effectively thrown out of the court, which has become the greatest crime of all time. The petition was of major magnitude and was reduced to nothing under the oversight of the 100th Congress.

Section Four - Donald S. Drusky and All the People of the Fifty States of the United States of America, Plaintiffs, v. U. S. Attorney General Janet Reno and the U. S. Attorney for Each U. S. District Court of the Eighty-Eight U. S. District Courts of the United States of America, Defendants.

Legal Setting: Donald S. Drusky and the People of the Fifty States, as Plaintiffs in this action, invoke U. S. C. A. 28, Section 1361 to gain jurisdiction over U. S. Attorney General Janet Reno and the U. S. Attorney for each U. S. District Court of the 88 U. S. District Courts of the United States of America. At Note 4. Mandamus under Public Citizen v. Rantor 864 F. Supp. 208 (D. D. C. 1994), it reads as follows: Purpose of Mandamus Act section providing court with an extraordinary remedy to "compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to plaintiff" was not to expand traditional scope of mandamus, but to provide that remedy to federal courts outside District of Columbia. 28 U. S. C. A. § 1361. (The 88 U. S. District Courts of the Fifty States are obviously outside the District of Columbia.)

Claim of Relief Sought: Donald S. Drusky and the People seek a court order to compel U. S. Attorney General Janet Reno and the 88 U. S. Attorneys of their respective districts to prosecute all Defendants cited in Sections Two and Three of this petition for violations set forth in the Legal Setting of Sections Two and Three. Additionally, the duty of the Defendants of Section 4 is clear and indisputable.

Factual Setting: The factual setting is outlined in the Factual Setting under Sections Two and Three. A writ of mandamus must be issued by the 88 U. S. District Courts directing U. S. Attorney General Janet Reno and the 88 U. S. Attorneys of the 88 U. S. District Courts to immediately initiate prosecution of the defendants listed under Sections Two and Three of this petition.

Section Five - Donald S. Drusky and All the People of the Fifty States of the United States of America, Plaintiffs, v. Federal Communications Commission, Defendant, with American Broadcasting Company, Columbia Broadcasting System (erroneously captioned as Columbia Broadcasting Company), National Broadcasting Company, Fox Broadcasting Company and Cable News Network, as Necessary or Indispensable Parties.

Legal Setting: Donald S. Drusky and the People of the Fifty States, as Plaintiffs in this action, invoke the Legal Setting set forth in Section Four of this petition to gain jurisdiction over the FCC in Section Five of this petition. The people further invoke U. S. C. A. 47, Section 411 (a) Joinder of Parties to gain jurisdiction of the 88 U. S. District Courts. - Additionally, the people invoke U. S. C. A. 47, Section 401. Enforcement provisions.

Claims of Relief Sought: If participants ABC, CBS, NBC, FOX and CNN do not formally volunteer their facilities to the people, an order by the 88 U. S. District Courts directing Defendant Federal Communications Commission to immediately, in the public interest and convenience, order the News Division of participants ABC, CBS, NBC, FOX and CNN to furnish their facilities to the people to inform all the people of the 50 states of the contents of this entire petition to the 88 U.S. District Courts of the United States of America.

The Factual Setting: The factual setting is outlined in the over-all petition with supporting exhibits to the 88 U. S. District Courts. More specifically, at the base of page 4 of the petition to the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia, a motion was made to join the FCC as a defendant. The FCC failed to act on its own power and motion in the public convenience, interest or necessity in violation of U.S. C. A. 47, Section 403.

Conclusion: The misconduct of elected public officials at the federal and state levels of government must be brought before the public. The fact that Congress and the 50 State Legislatures do not legislatively redress grievances must be brought to the attention of the people. The people of America cannot govern America with the news media only informing the public about floods and tomadoes, murders and bank robberies, house fires and automobile accidents, the medical report, the scores of the ball games, the weather forecast, and the lottery numbers. The people have the right to regulate their government. The people cannot possibly regulate their government without knowing the misconduct of public officials, which is being suppressed by the news media. A very important and appropriate legal precedent can be found at 354 U.S. at page 200. The pertinent sentence reads: "The public is, of course, entitled to be informed concerning the workings of its government."

The law authorizes mandamus and circumstances require it. If, for example, an order is not issued by the 88 U. S. District Courts to compel the FCC to perform a duty owed to the People Plaintiffs, they would remain (as they have unknowingly been) as subjects of the federal and 50 state governments, and the people would remain in the dark and uninformed. The case is clear and undisputable for the 88 U. S. District Courts to issue mandamus upon the FCC. The FCC must act in the public convenience, and it is of great interest and necessity that the people be promptly informed of their case in the 88 U. S. District Courts. The people must have broad access to their case in the 88 U. S. District Courts. Under U. S. C. A. Constitution Amendment 1 and 14, the people are entitled to receive information and ideas, which includes the entire contents of their case before the 88 U. S. District Courts.

In its action on licenses, the FCC is to be guided by the "touchstone" of "public convenience, interest or necessity," which is the standard provided by law for licensing of radio and television broadcasting stations. No television or radio broadcasting license may be granted unless the licensee serves the public interest, and licensees have a duty to operate their stations so as to serve the public interest, the station being deemed a trustee for the public. The FCC must act so that the people may have the best possible radio and television service. In this particular case, the news media is serving the interest of the corrupt U S X Corporation and the United Steelworkers of America, and all levels of government, which are not redressing grievances under Amendment One. More specifically, the U S X Corporation and the United Steelworkers of America have censored my picketing in Pittsburgh and elsewhere, and also censored all my legal activity in the courts. Under U. S. C. A. 47, Section 326. Censorship, it bars the FCC the power of censorship over radio communication. If it bars the FCC the power of censorship, it obviously bars the U S X Corporation and the United Steelworkers of America with the power of censorship, which has been without restraint to the present date. Under U. S. C. A. 47, Section 326. Censorship, people invoke the following citation: "This section declaring national policy does not authorize states to exercise censorship specifically denied to the federal agency. *Allen B. Dumont Laboratories v. Carroll*, C. A. Pa. 1950, 184 F. 2d 153, certiorari denied 71 S. Ct. 490, 340 U.S. 929, 95 L. Ed. 670." Working from this brief citation under U. S. C. A. 47, Section 326. Censorship; the 50 states, the federal government, U S X Corporation and the United Steelworkers of America cannot censor the people's case before the 88 U. S. District Courts. Neither can the 88 U. S. District Courts, which can only issue mandamus for the broadcasting news media to bring case before the 88 U. S. District Courts to the attention of the public.

Under Amendment One's Freedom of Speech and Press, the people invoke in their favor the following citations: "Rights of viewers and general public under this clause are paramount and supersede those of broadcasters. *DeFilippo v. National Broadcasting Co., Inc.*, R.I. 1982, 446 A.2d 1036." and "Because the broadcast media utilize a valuable and limited public resource, there is also present an unusual order of values under this amendment: although the broadcaster is not without protection under this amendment, it is the right of the viewers and listeners which is paramount. *Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. v. Democratic National Committee*, U.S. Dist. Col. 1973, 93 S.Ct. 2086, 412 U.S. 94, 36 L.Ed. 2d 772."

Under U.S.C.A. 47, Section 412, this entire document with exhibits before the 88 U.S. District Courts shall be preserved as public records (upon service to the Commission) in the custody of the secretary of the Commission, and shall be received as prima facie evidence of what they purport to be for the purpose of investigations by the Commission and in all judicial proceedings.

Finally and even more specifically, there is a public issue discussion requirement. The people invoke in their favor the following citation under U.S.C.A. 47, Section 326 Censorship: "Commission is authorized to require licensees to use stations for discussion of public issues, and is free to implement requirement by reasonable rules and regulations which fall short of abridgement of freedom of speech and press and of censorship proscribed by statute. *Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. F.C.C.*, Dist. Col. 1969, 89 S.Ct. 1794, 395 U.S. 367, 23 L.Ed. 2d 371."

For all the above reasons, an order (mandamus) must be issued by the 88 U.S. District Courts directing defendant Federal Communication Commission to immediately in the public interest order the News Division of the American Broadcasting Company, Columbia Broadcasting System, National Broadcasting Company, Fox Broadcasting Company and Cable News Network to inform the people of their case in the 88 U.S. District Courts. The public must not be kept in the dark. Under the eyes of alert public opinion, a just solution to the problem must be found. Under U.S.C.A. 47, Section 326, on behalf of the people, the programming of facts and law against the federal and state governments cannot be censored.

In the alternative, the people seek to purchase the furnishing of broadcast facilities to inform the public of their case before the 88 U.S. District Courts. The people invoke U.S.C.A. 47, Section 406. Compelling furnishing of facilities; mandamus; jurisdiction.

The 88 U.S. District Courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over the broadcasters to issue writs of mandamus against the broadcasters to furnish facilities for such communication or transmission to the parties (people of America) applying for the writ. If advertisers will not sponsor the communication to the people, the people motion to pay for the furnishing of broadcast facilities from public funds. The air waves belong to the people, and the people are entitled to buy air wave time.

Section Six - The Case of Donald S. Drusky, Petitioner, v. The Sovereign People of the United States of America, Defendants and/or Respondents.

The Legal Setting: Petitioner Donald S. Drusky invokes U.S.C.A. 28, Section 1331 to gain jurisdiction over the Sovereign People of the United States of America. Donald S. Drusky also invokes the following citations regarding the Constitution and Amendment One: The "Constitution" of the United States is the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every state are bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of their own state to the contrary notwithstanding. *Atkinson v. Woodmansee*, 74 P. 640, 641, 68 Kan. 71, 64 L.R.A. 325. The federal Constitution is a compact established by the people of the United States, and not by the states in their sovereign capacity. *In re Opinion of the Justices*, 107 A. 673, 674, 118 Me. 544, 5 A.L.R. 1412. The "constitution" is a solemn mandate by the people to various branches of government, and Supreme Court would be derelict in its duty if it permitted such mandates to be circumvented, regardless of the court's personal desires, no matter how expedient such circumvention might appear at the time. *Proy v. Yelle*, 176 P.2d 459, 27 Wash. 2d 99, 170 A.L.R. 1425.

A constitution is defined by Judge Story to be a fundamental law or basis of government. It is established by the people, in their own original, sovereign capacity, to promote their own happiness, and permanently to secure their rights, property, independence and common welfare. *McKown v. Davies*, N.Y., 3 Barb. 196, 198, quoting 1 Story, *Const.* §§ 338, 339; *Church v. Kelsey*, Pa. 7. S. Ct. 897, 898, 121 U.S. 282, 30 L. Ed. 960. A constitution is but a higher form of statutory law, and it is entirely competent for the people, if they so desire, to incorporate into it self-executing enactments. *Willis v. Mabon*, 56 N.W. 1110, 1111, 48 Minn. 140, 16 L.R.A. 281, 31 Am. St. Rep. 626. That the rights to freedom of speech and press were coupled in a single guaranty with the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition for redress of grievances was not by accident or coincidence but all these, though not identical are inseparable, and are cognate rights. U. S. C. A. *Const. Amend. 1*. *Thomas v. Collins*, 65 S. Ct. 315. Under *Richmond Newspapers, Inc. v. Commonwealth of Virginia*, 100 Supreme Court Reporter 2814 at page 2815, Notes 8, 9, and 14 read as follows: - Note 8. Constitutional law: Expressly guaranteed freedoms of First Amendment share common core purpose of assuring freedom of communication on matters relating to functioning of government. - Note 9. Constitutional law: The free speech carries with it some freedom to listen. - Note 14. Constitutional law: Very purpose of First Amendment is to guarantee all facets of each right described. Notes 8, 9, and 14 are each concluded with: (Per Chief Justice Burger, Two Justices concurring, and four Justices concurring in the judgment.) U. S. C. A. *Const. Amend. 1*.

Donald S. Drusky further invokes the following citations regarding the description of the Sovereign People of the United States: The words "sovereign people" are familiarly used to describe the political body, who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereign, and who hold the power and conduct the government through their representatives. Every citizen is one of these people and a constituent member of the sovereignty. *Scott v. Sanford*, MO. 60 U.S. 393, 404, 19 How. 393, 404, 15 L. Ed. 691. Who, or what, is sovereignty? In one sense, the term "sovereign" has for its correlative "subject." In this sense, the term can receive no application; for it has no object in the Constitution of the United States. Under that Constitution there are citizens but no subjects. The term "subject" occurs, indeed, once in the instrument; but to mark the contrast strongly the epithet "foreign" is prefixed. *Chisholm v. State of Georgia*, 2 U.S. 419, 455, 2 Dall. 419, 455, 1 L. Ed. 440.

The Factual Setting: In the past and present, the government of America is not being properly conducted by Congress and the Legislature of the Fifty States of the United States of America. This suit in the 88 U. S. District Courts presents a great future for America. They have failed their people and their country. They are arbitrarily not representing or redressing the grievances of the people of America. This means the people are subjects of the federal government and their respective state government. In order to gain the status of citizenship, the people are confronted with the responsibility to remove all elected members of Congress and their respective state legislature from office. At that point, the people will positively be the body politic. Over a quarter billion people will temporarily become the new Congress and their respective state legislature. Instead of a quarter billion people being reduced down by election to 535 members of Congress, it will be a Congress of a quarter billion members with the 88 U. S. District Courts as its Capitol. Likewise, the U. S. District Court(s) within each state will be the new Capitol of their respective legislature. In any event, the people can supersede their government in the 88 U. S. District Courts. As subjects, the people have an opportunity to truly become citizens during their case before the 88 U. S. District Courts. The legal setting of Section Six makes it clear that "sovereignty" is the right to govern. Even without removing elected officials from Congress or any state legislature, the people can independently enact legislation.

Wherefore, Petitioner Donald S. Drusky seeks from the sovereign people of the United States of America the following:

Constitutional and Legislative Solutions Sought:

The Problem: Congress and the Legislature of the 50 States of the United States of America do not legislatively redress meritorious grievances under Amendment One of the Constitution.
The Solution: Enter an Amendment to the U. S. Constitution and all State Constitutions. The Amendment shall be as follows: This Amendment bars all other legislative process until the legislative redress of meritorious grievances occurs first.

The merits of each grievance shall be determined by a special permanent "Committee for the Redress of Grievances." The Committee shall be composed of individuals, with preference given to priests with extremely high moral and religious standards, two elected from each state and one from the District of Columbia area. Amongst the 101 members, they shall elect their own President for each term. The term shall be for a four year period. The President shall have no vote unless the Committee be equally divided. The Committee shall have oversight by the presiding Pope in aid of the "Church's Obligation to Secure Redress of Grievances under Amendment One." The Church, in this instance, being deemed as a coordinate of the United States Government to satisfy Catholic Church doctrine and doctrine of any other religion. The Committee shall be formally sworn in by oath. Violators of the oath shall be subject to false oath and prosecuted in a Church Court under a canon law prohibiting false oath or perjury. Violators of the oath shall be removed. Freedom of Religion shall meet its Amendment One obligation toward redress through the Committee for Redress of Grievances. Minor grievances can outrightly be redressed by the Committee without any further Congressional process to ease the burden on major legislation pending in Congress. Major grievances can be submitted to Congress with or without the Committee's recommendation for redress. The Committee has the power to order a moratorium on all other legislative process, or schedule with Congress a prompt review of the grievance subject to redress. Accordingly, each state shall establish a Committee for the Redress of Grievances.

Note: The number 101 can be deleted entirely to save correction to 103, if another state is annexed to the United States. The District of Columbia area is permanently fixed with one member, even if it ever gains statehood. The Catholic Church may need to reinstate perjury canon law.

The Problem: The federal and state courts have been invaded by political and special interest pressures. They encroached upon the dignity of the Courts and its Officers, and infringed upon another's right. Congress or any State Legislature made no effort to insulate their courts or any prosecuting officer from ruthless political coercion.

The Solution: Enter an Amendment to the U. S. Constitution and all State Constitutions. The Amendment shall be as follows: This Amendment establishes a special permanent "Committee for Judicial Oversight." The Committee shall be composed of Law Professors, Lawyers or retired Judges. Two members shall be elected from each state and one from the District of Columbia area. The Committee shall elect its President for each term. The term shall be for a four year period. The President shall have no vote unless the Committee be equally divided. The Committee will insulate the Courts and its Officers from political and special interest pressures. The Committee shall have investigatory power to process meritorious complaints regarding obvious problems with any Court or Officer not properly administering law or justice over valid petitions submitted to their Court and criminal complaints. The parties responsible for coercing a Clerk of Court and/or Judge of a Court shall be criminally prosecuted by the Committee for Judicial Oversight. The U. S. Attorney General, State Attorney General, U. S. Attorney or local District Attorney are Officers of the Court. The parties responsible for coercing any prosecuting attorney to avoid criminal prosecution shall be criminally prosecuted by the Committee for Judicial Oversight. They shall face civil prosecution by the victim(s) suffering the injustice. If a Judge, Clerk of Court, or any Prosecuting Attorney does not report the incident to the Committee for Judicial Oversight, they shall be directly removed from office and criminally prosecuted by the Committee. They shall face civil prosecution by the victim(s) suffering the injustice. Any private attorney or lawyers involved anywhere in the sequence of events to obstruct justice shall face permanent disbarment and criminal prosecution by the Committee for Judicial Oversight. The shyster lawyer or law firm shall face civil prosecution by the victim(s) suffering the injustice. Any party tampering with the Committee for Judicial Oversight shall face criminal contempt prosecution by the Committee and face civil prosecution by the victim(s).

Note: The Amendment regarding the Committee for the Redress of Grievances could be Section One of the next Amendment. The Amendment regarding the Committee for Judicial Oversight could be Section Two of the Amendment, or each can be given a separate Amendment Number. In addition to the Amendment, the members of each Committee shall receive compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. There needs to be a special building constructed for the offices of the members of each Committee and a large assembly room to convene. The best money ever spent for America.

The Problem: Apart from removing members of Congress or any State Legislature from office, the people can supersede an incompetent Congress or any State Legislature. If there are any doubts about the sovereign people having the independent right to enact legislation, the people can remove that doubt by having the right to compact through the judicial system to legislate.

The Solution: Enter an Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and all State Constitutions. The Amendment shall be as follows: Congress or any State Legislature shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of enacting necessary and proper legislation through the judicial system. The people reserve the right to remove from office members of Congress or any State Legislature through the judicial system.

The Problem: Congress and all State Legislatures do not have a Clean Hands Policy. Apart from the judicial system being invaded by political and special interest pressures, the Congress and any State Legislature have been even more easily invaded by political and special interest pressures. The most that members of Congress did for Donald S. Dzusky is to provide reports on my behalf from the National Labor Relations Board. Some of the reports are on exhibit. None of all the reports were infallibly interpreted by the Courts, but were skipped over by the Courts as if they did not exist. However, they are real. Unfair labor practices committed by the former U. S. Steel Corporation (now USX Corp.) and the United Steelworkers of America are the object of the reports by the National Labor Relations Board. Once the company and union "secured" an obstruction of justice at the Judicial Branch of Government, they invaded the Legislative Branch of Government to hinder a redress and hinder the establishment of a Special Court to properly process civil and criminal complaints against the company and union. They have friends in Congress and can get to almost anybody. Juries in civil and criminal cases can't be tampered with, and neither can Congress or any State Legislature. In essence, Congress is a jury for redress. Once some members of Congress are tampered by the USX Corp. and United Steelworkers, they have tampered with the jury affecting a redress of grievance. A clear example of the situation in Congress and all State Legislatures is by using another extreme to perfectly describe the circumstances. Synonymously, it would be like the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II, inviting the Devil to be the "Guest of Honor" at the Vatican and have "Tea and Cookies" with the Pope. The Pope and Devil are rivals, and it is not the Devil's right to demand of the Pope exactly which Canon Law of the Church should be repealed or abolished, and what type of new Canon Law for the Church to enact. Thereafter, insist upon the Pope to not represent Donald S. Dzusky. The lawmakers in Congress and any State Legislature are to be rivals of felons. Corrupt politicians seek favors in Congress and any State Legislature to the detriment of the innocent and powerless. Of course, the Pope would avoid the Devil. But, it is not a matter, of course, for Congress or any State Legislature to avoid the corrupt. Most importantly, there were times my case came up in Congress. The USX Corporation and the United Steelworkers of America had direct knowledge regarding Congress and my grievances. Each time my case came up in Congress, it was set aside without my knowledge of it. I gained knowledge of it on the streets. Moreover, on December 22, 1985, while crossing a street in East McKeesport, Pennsylvania, I was hit by a car and by ambulance was brought to McKeesport Hospital. I had a broken leg and a broken nose besides cuts and bruises. USX Corp. and United Steelworkers gained knowledge of my unfortunate accident, and used this opportunity to secretly and corruptly intervene into all phases of the car accident case to suit their satisfaction. Meanwhile, the car accident case provided the USX Corp. and the United Steelworkers of America with the opportunity to prey upon members of Congress. They made their way around Congress to prevent any "due legislative effort" by Congress to redress Donald S. Dzusky's grievances. The accident stopped the constant Rhythm of my picketing, and stopped the work to draft three new law suits. The accident ruined over 19 years of picketing for redress, and I lost my train of thought to properly draft the three law suits. From August 8, 1966 (date of illegal discharge from employment by the U. S. Steel Corporation while picketing the United Steelworkers of America for \$2500 that the union owed me, which I will donate to Children's Hospital) till December 1985, I maintained steady picketing in Pittsburgh. It did seem soon that I may gain a redress through legislation by the 20 year point of discharge, or 20 year period of picketing, or by date of August 8, 1986. Originally, I had it planned to start work to draft the three court petitions at about 8 o'clock in the evening of Dec. 22, 1985. The documents were to be submitted simultaneously to the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the U. S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and the United States Supreme Court. I was hit by a car at 5:30 in the late afternoon of December 22, 1985.

I hoped to mail the three petitions by February 1, 1986. The car accident ruined the triple court petition and immediately stopped my picketing to expose Congress towards redress. I was keenly aware that I had to improve upon the original valid petitions for the three courts to process, or I may spend another 20 years of picketing in Pittsburgh for a legislative redress by Congress. It was best then to submit each petition as it was completed. Eventually, a petition dated June 28, 1986, was submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court. A petition dated March 31, 1987 was received by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. A petition dated August 14, 1987 was submitted to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. I am under a medical disability and progress is slow. Copies of the reduced in size August 14, 1987 petition on exhibit were served upon all 100 U.S. Senators and almost all 435 U.S. Representatives to no avail, and it became the subject and object of this petition in the 89 U.S. District Courts of the Fifty States. This further demonstrates the need for a Committee for the Redress of Grievances, and a Committee for Judicial Oversight, and the right of the people to compact in the courts to legislate over an incompetent Congress, and a "Clean Hands Policy."

The Solution: Enter an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and all State Constitutions adopting a "Clean Hands Policy." The Amendment shall be as follows: Congress and all State Legislatures shall adopt a "Clean Hands Policy." They shall not entertain the unlawfulness of the guilty against the right of the innocent. "Racism" and "Partiality," the tendency to show special kindness to some while neglecting others who have equal claims, are abolished in Congress and all the State Legislatures. Known felons are barred from the premises of Congress or any State Legislature, either in person, by phone or by mail. Convicts in prison may write or call by phone their representatives in Congress or their legislature, if they need to do so over problems within the prison, or for entrapment, false imprisonment, or being framed, or wrongfully convicted.

The Conclusion: These proposed Amendments shall guarantee the common defense of the legally disabled and disenfranchised, that are victims of great injustice under extremely severe burden. Therefore, the sovereign people of the United States of America, in order to form a more perfect Union, strengthen the Country, improve the Administration of Justice, insure a Redress of Grievances and promote the general Welfare must ordain and establish these Amendments to the Constitution of the United States and all State Constitutions.

The Problem: On Exhibit 'BB' attached to this petition is a reduced in size copy of a valid unfair labor practice charge against the United States Senate and House of Representatives dated March 3, 1972. Viewed on Exhibit 'B' is a copy of a three page report dated May 29, 1969 from former U.S. Senator Harold B. Hughes. Near the bottom of page 3, regarding charge 6 - CB-1669-8, it points out that former Union president David McDonald had caused 25,000 workers to be illegally discharged during his term of office. Legislation pertaining to the charge against Congress would balance the National Labor Relations Act, which would reduce unrest and industrial strife. Congress carelessly failed to enact necessary and proper labor legislation for America and its work force. The work force is the number one asset of America.

The Solution: Balance the National Labor Relations Act as outlined in the charge of March 3, 1972. **The Problem:** The National Labor Relations Act is remedial not criminal.

The Solution: Incorporate into the National Labor Relations Act a provision to make it criminal for an employer, or for a union to cause an employer to illegally discharge a person from employment. All parties participating in the illegal discharge shall face a 5 year prison penalty. The legislation should be derived from Pennsylvania Penal Code 18 P.S. § 4669 - Coercion of employees, which carried a one year prison penalty, but was repealed absolutely with other acts on December 6, 1972. It was replaced with a new law effective June 6, 1973 - 18 Pa. C.S.A. § 2906 - Criminal coercion - with the penalty increased from 1 to 5 years. The corrective legislation to make the National Labor Relations Act criminal should be patterned after the combined 18 P.S. § 4669 + 2906. Coercing an official of the National Labor Relations Board to withhold action over an illegal discharge must also carry a 5 year prison penalty. A new U.S. Criminal Coercion Law similar to 18 Pa. C.S.A. § 2906 must be enacted to protect all departments, any U.S. Attorney, or U.S. Attorney General and the Courts from criminal coercion by powerful political establishments. The people must disestablish and permanently dismantle the United Steelworkers of America for disenfranchising and breaking the 25,000 workers illegally discharged. The AFL - CIO compounded the discharge and must also be dismantled. Permanently occupy and quarantine the U.S. X Corp. from everyday politics.

Section Seven - The Case of Donald S. Drusky, Plaintiff, v. God, Defendant.

The Legal Setting: This is a claim for a divine redress and special favors arising under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, all as more fully set forth in the Factual Setting. The 88 U. S. District Courts have jurisdiction by reason of U.S.C.A. 28, Section 1331. The complaint regarding Defendant God centers on a broken Oath to God under Article VI of the Constitution to support the Constitution. The executive, legislative and judicial officers of both the United States and the 50 States of America willfully broke their Oath to God to support the Constitution. One cannot support the Constitution when one does not redress grievances under Amendment One of the Constitution. Article VI is invoked and reads in pertinent part as follows: "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States." The legal setting includes the Abridged Text of the Ten Commandments in Exodus 20:1-17 (R.S.V.), at IX. You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor (vs. 16), and the Abridged Text of the Ten Commandments in Deuteronomy 5:6-21 (R.S.V.), at VIII. Neither shall you bear false witness against your neighbor (vs. 20).

The Factual Setting: The Oath of Office (violated by all officers cited within the petition on exhibit dated August 14, 1987) was compounded by all government officials under solemn declaration that were served process in that case. The first six sections of this petition before the 88 U. S. District Courts provide the legal and factual background in support of the valid claim against Defendant God. A copy of the, reduced in size August 14, 1987 petition and exhibits were sent to Pope John Paul II to keep the Holy Father informed of my problems with the U. S. Government. According to Catholic Doctrine, the Church is not a subordinate of the United States Government, but is a coordinate of the U. S. Government. The Catholic Church is guaranteed and enjoying "freedom of religion" under Amendment One. Therefore, the Catholic Church must guarantee and secure a redress of grievances under Amendment One. The Catholic Church did not honor their responsibility and failed to secure a redress of Donald S. Drusky's grievances and all others similarly situated. Donald S. Drusky is a victim of the crime of perjury, which is also a crime against the Church. The Catholic Church discontinued the Canon of Perjury since it became common law. Perjury is condemned by all forms of government. The Catholic Church as a coordinate of the U. S. Government, and as a member of the association of rights under Amendment One, hypocritically and arbitrarily, made no effort to rectify the crime of perjury or secure the redress of grievances. This has ruined the life of Donald S. Drusky.

Claim for Divine Redress and Special Favors: Plaintiff Donald S. Drusky respectfully asks Defendant God to grant a Divine Redress and Special Favors. I firmly believe I am worthy of a Divine Redress and Special Favors I ask of Thee at this time. Therefore, Plaintiff prays: That Princess Diana and the other two victims of the car accident in France be returned to life or resurrected. I am asking Thee for resurrection or restore to life Amelia Airhart, Nicole Brown and Ronald Goldman, JonBenet Ramsey, Anne Frank (died at a Nazi extermination camp at Belzen in 1945 at age 15) and her mother and father, Karla Faye Tucker executed by law in Texas on February 3, 1998, and Emperor Nicholas II, Empress Alexandra, their five children and four servants that were executed in Russia on July 17, 1918. The return to life entrance shall be at Market Square, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. I am also asking Thee to cure Pope John Paul's Parkinson's Disease and restore the Holy Father to good health. Included for resurrection are all the members of Anne Frank's family and friends (8) that lived in mortal fear of being discovered, and were betrayed and arrested, while hiding in Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Application for Appointment of Counsel: Petitioner Donald S. Drusky and the Sovereign People of America are applying to each of the 88 U. S. District Courts for "Appointment of Counsel" to represent this case before the 88 U. S. District Courts.

Motion for Leave to Proceed on Public Funds: Public funds belong to the Sovereign People and the people move that this money must be made available for use to pay court fees and costs, counsel.

Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis: Petitioner Donald S. Drusky moves for leave to proceed in forma pauperis under U.S.C.A. 28 § 1915, and in support thereof attaches the affidavit by Donald S. Drusky. On the reverse side of affidavit is a copy of a letter dated Aug. 24, 1987 from the Office of the Clerk of the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia over petition exhibited.

Respectfully submitted,
Donald S. Drusky, Petitioner Pro Se

In the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia

Donald S. Drusky, Plaintiff,

Office of the President of the
United States of America,
and the United States of America
and President Ronald Reagan,
and God,
Defendants.

Civil Action No.

To the Honorable, the Judges of the above said Court:

Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis

Plantiff Donald A. Crowley moves for leave to proceed in forma pauperis under Title 28 § 1915 for the following reasons:

I have been unemployed and disabled since August 8, 1946 discharge by U.S. Steel. Attached as Exhibit #1 is a copy of the August 8, 1946 "Accident and Unemployment Council of the Social Security Administration", which shows I was discharged on August 8, 1946. I have been on disability benefits since September 1946. I currently receive \$541 per month in Social Security Disability Benefits and \$20 per month in food stamps. I have \$7.77 in the United National Bank. The last payee on May 15-18, 1948 petition to the Social Security, Vice President Smith, and 4 Senators, 935 members of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Governors of the 50 States of the United States of America, ABC News, CBS News, NBC News, United Press, Associated Press, The Hearst News Paper and 5,000 others reads as follows: "I am again appealing for public funds to pursue redress of grievances. The request was ignored. Attached, by exhibit #2, is a copy of the 15-18, 1948 petition with a front to back attached exhibit. I can only provide the front with copies of the 2 exhibits in support of motion to proceed in forma pauperis. I have no savings bonds and do not own an automobile, house or other valuable property but only own ordinary household furnishings and clothing. Because of my poverty, I am unable to pay court fees and costs.

Therefore, Donald A. Bruckley moves for leave to proceed in forma pauperis be granted.

and Complaint Against the Office of the President of the United States of America, and the United States of America for Sole Arrest and Sole Imprisonment in Violation of Amendment Four, and for Failure to Redress Grievances in Violation of Amendment One of the Constitution of the United States of America

I, Donald S. Crosby, respectfully submit the following:

Repealed Slavery of America through its elected officers obligated to redemptions and should not arrest in social circles unless meeting members of non-progressive movements. All but on 3 or more occasions. I picked President Johnson at the White House in Washington, D.C. On May 3, 1867, I picked the President over my employment problems. On June 27, 1867, I picked the President over my employment and the National Relations League. On July 17, 1867, I was on my knees at the White House from 4 o'clock to 5 o'clock with a placard in front of me that read to follow: "Dear Mr. President, I need help. It is an emergency. Please, believe me. Please give me a chance. Please have mercy. Please help me. Please. Please give mercy. Please." Very truly yours, Daniel S. Crosby. I carried pictures of each from me and the American flag were also mentioned on the placard. On the occasion, even though I was killed on an entrance to the White House, I was falsely arrested and falsely imprisoned in violation of United States II of the Constitution, which resulted in my denial of progress and a violation by the Office of the President of my rights of freedom under Grandmaster One of the Constitution. Attached as Exhibit 3 is a copy of a letter about that review picture of picket signs I used at White House at date I picked the White House. The letter will be provided with a copy of the picture. Used on the attached Exhibit 4 is a copy of page 4 from my eight page statement that was included with the three page report. (When exhibit was marked as Exhibit 3) dated March 17, 1867, which Senator Edward Kennedy received on my behalf from the National Relations League. On the bottom paragraph of page 4, I erroneously show I was arrested on May 3, 1867 with placard over employment. Actually, I was arrested only once at the White House and it was on July 17, 1867. It false arrest and imprisonment compounded the disability of Omaha S. Crosby, who is suffering a disability injustice.

The reason for my appearance at the White House was to press the President to pass on redressing my grievances since I previously failed to do so. The reason for the oral was to not redress a meritorious grievance. In my recollections following the United States and Chinese Administrations in Peking and my oral was a big factor as they were laughing about it. In any event, the next day I was transferred from the President's suite to the Camp outside the courtroom. The prosecuting attorney told me that I am free to go because there was too much privacy behind my actions. At the President's trial, no change was filed by the prosecuting attorney. It is prosecution by the prosecuting attorney and no change filed by a prosecuting attorney amounts to a proper legal case of false oral and false information, in violation of the President and Government of the United States of America to not redressing grievances. (Oral is not a false oral made by another if it is directed, relevant, corroborated, encouraged, or unrefuted oral. - Robinson v. Campbell 399 F.2d 237) The Court here under rules of authority ordered me at the White House trial. At the President's trial, my petition was without any legal authority. It was an ordered callous and malicious attack and defamatory my meritorious Amendment II. They know the causes are unlawful oral and defamatory, and all persons participating in an unlawful oral and defamatory are liable.

The people of America and the general public of America are totally unaware that they are not going to beat the White House with cannon and placards. The Government of the United States of America, and causes approved by it, is not redressing wrongs, and they compound the problem by collectively sitting tight through all of trouble, to no avail in their pursuit of redress and justice. The Chief of the President of the White House has been punishing all petitioners for redress like they were that White slavery redress. I was forced by the difficult circumstances that I was aware of to be confronted with all of the White House, I not only knew and broke the White House for going with petitioners, but also with a full tall wooden cross made from 2" x 4" lumber. I knelt and "was entitled to the right and liberty of redress and justice but, instead, I faced an ugly arrest and horrendous dog and humiliation after false arrest and detention in jail. I have come gathered on the White House sidewalk and across the street, it took time for them to get to me to make the arrest. The overall experience amounted to a long, terrible nightmare. The White House has completely disregarded my grievances and the "full tall wooden cross" infers the neglect of not redressing wrongs. The wooden cross gave me comfort that the White House was taking notice. The matter was cruelly and abused by the same media. The Chief of the White House acted as a puppet to President Lyndon Johnson of the White House as President of the United States. The people did not elect the President of any country of Congress to disregard grievances subject to redress under Amendment Number One of the Constitution. The Chief of the President is bound by the Constitution and his oath of office to redress grievances and, has failed to do so. His arrest, false power have been made on the first place and my grievance against the National Civil Liberties Union should have been immediately redressed. The false arrest and failure to redress grievances severely defamed and ruined the life of Oswald A. Limery.

Legal Complaints Against President Ronald Reagan and the United States of America for Violation of International Law of that a Constitution and Action to Compel President Ronald Reagan to Perform his Duty Oath to Conduct Society

[illegible][illegible]

The people of America have the right to be participants in government other than just paying taxes and actually voting Congress the power and redress grievances. The people of America have the right to full participation in the process of government. President Abraham Lincoln's November 9, 1863 Address at Gettysburg ended with the following quotation: "That this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that this government of the people, by the people, shall not perish from the earth." Mr. Lincoln did not say this to depict the government as a mere puppet. The Americans in this case would not be doing Abraham Lincoln's great job by forming a mere puppet government for America that would meet that a satisfaction. There will be no "government of the people" to the people, with a special United States Committee for the Address of Grievances" as established after the war legally prior by constitutional amendment. The defendants in this case are charged to demonstrate for an addition of two people from each state of America and one from the District of Columbia to the United States Committee for the Address of Grievances. One member would serve as President of the United States Committee for the Address of Grievances. The committee shall be actually and personally insulated from political interference and control by public officials and parties, with the corrupt political parties all over America. The committee shall have a strict and strong code of ethics, a shall have the responsibility and power to initiate formal congressional proceedings against those who have unwisely accepted corrupt political favors from any branch of government, including the President, the President, members of Congress, any department, agency or Court. Moral standards of President Reagan are proposed standards. This President Bush and Congress retain their power by authority not by passing resolutions. The constitution, mandates must be maintained with only the original all the individuals.

Therefore, the motions to join the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives and Vice President Donald Trump as defendants must be granted.

Carb Complaint Against Ronald Reagan, George Bush and All Individuals of Congress (Except the New Members of the 100th Congress) for Violation of Amendment One of the Constitution of the United States of America

[illegible]

Motion to join the U. S. Senate and U. S. House of Representatives and Vice President Spiro T. Agnew as Defendants

When it is desired to move to join the U.S. Senate, U.S. House of Representatives and Vice President George Bush, as defendants as provided by Rule 9(a)(2)(1) and Rule 20 of The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 19 is the proper reference. According to Rule 19(a)(1), a party shall be joined in the action if it is absent complete relief will not be accorded amongst those already parties. Under Rule 20, it need not be parties for as follows: "All persons may be joined in one action if only questions of law or fact common to all defendants will arise in the action."

The President, Vice President and every member of Congress are partly responsible and must be joined together to provide a redress, which they have previously failed to achieve for all citizens of America. In this form, I have attached Exhibit 1, 2, 3, 4, and Exhibit 1 - 8 for the Court. Exhibit 1 - 8 will also be forwarded to each of our Senators and all 435 U. S. Representatives and Vice President Spiro T. Agnew on Exhibit 1 as approved by a large petition (reduced in size) dated June 28, 1964 to the U. S. Supreme Court against the 50 states of the United States of America seeking redress of grievances on my behalf and on behalf of all citizens of America. With the bottom paragraph of page one of the petition, I made an appeal to "Hear us". We

Background information on the overall problem that Ronald & Emily & me as the United States 1st, 2nd & 3rd of the House, but the House. The record on Exhibit 'B' dated November 21, 1960, that we as the House. Emily & I began & various other public officials and organizations, which included ABC, CBS and NBC. Exhibit 'A' 1st & 2nd & 3rd & 4th & 5th & 6th & 7th & 8th & 9th & 10th & 11th & 12th & 13th & 14th & 15th & 16th & 17th & 18th & 19th & 20th & 21st & 22nd & 23rd & 24th & 25th & 26th & 27th & 28th & 29th & 30th & 31st & 32nd & 33rd & 34th & 35th & 36th & 37th & 38th & 39th & 40th & 41st & 42nd & 43rd & 44th & 45th & 46th & 47th & 48th & 49th & 50th & 51st & 52nd & 53rd & 54th & 55th & 56th & 57th & 58th & 59th & 60th & 61st & 62nd & 63rd & 64th & 65th & 66th & 67th & 68th & 69th & 70th & 71st & 72nd & 73rd & 74th & 75th & 76th & 77th & 78th & 79th & 80th & 81st & 82nd & 83rd & 84th & 85th & 86th & 87th & 88th & 89th & 90th & 91st & 92nd & 93rd & 94th & 95th & 96th & 97th & 98th & 99th & 100th & 101st & 102nd & 103rd & 104th & 105th & 106th & 107th & 108th & 109th & 110th & 111st & 112nd & 113th & 114th & 115th & 116th & 117th & 118th & 119th & 120th & 121st & 122nd & 123rd & 124th & 125th & 126th & 127th & 128th & 129th & 130th & 131st & 132nd & 133th & 134th & 135th & 136th & 137th & 138th & 139th & 140th & 141st & 142nd & 143rd & 144th & 145th & 146th & 147th & 148th & 149th & 150th & 151st & 152nd & 153th & 154th & 155th & 156th & 157th & 158th & 159th & 160th & 161st & 162nd & 163rd & 164th & 165th & 166th & 167th & 168th & 169th & 170th & 171st & 172nd & 173rd & 174th & 175th & 176th & 177th & 178th & 179th & 180th & 181st & 182nd & 183rd & 184th & 185th & 186th & 187th & 188th & 189th & 190th & 191st & 192nd & 193rd & 194th & 195th & 196th & 197th & 198th & 199th & 200th & 201st & 202nd & 203rd & 204th & 205th & 206th & 207th & 208th & 209th & 210th & 211st & 212nd & 213th & 214th & 215th & 216th & 217th & 218th & 219th & 220th & 221st & 222nd & 223rd & 224th & 225th & 226th & 227th & 228th & 229th & 230th & 231st & 232nd & 233rd & 234th & 235th & 236th & 237th & 238th & 239th & 240th & 241st & 242nd & 243rd & 244th & 245th & 246th & 247th & 248th & 249th & 250th & 251st & 252nd & 253rd & 254th & 255th & 256th & 257th & 258th & 259th & 260th & 261st & 262nd & 263rd & 264th & 265th & 266th & 267th & 268th & 269th & 270th & 271st & 272nd & 273rd & 274th & 275th & 276th & 277th & 278th & 279th & 280th & 281st & 282nd & 283rd & 284th & 285th & 286th & 287th & 288th & 289th & 290th & 291st & 292nd & 29

Therefore, the motion to join the Federal Communications Commission as a defendant must be granted.

[illegible][illegible]

The executive, legislative and judicial officers of both the United States and the 50 States of America willfully refuse. That both the President and Congress have made a false oath to support the Constitution. They cannot support the Constitution when they do not have reverence under the Constitution Article VI of the Constitution reads in pertinent part as follows: "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States." dependent on the President for the damage and humiliation to himself & country. All persons making an oath to defend the land under Article VI from their Oath of Office. They go from the Judges of the Supreme Court to the Judges of the State Courts. "I judge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, an obligation to live, and to die, for the people and justice for all." (Public Law 287, 74 Congress, approved December 28, 1913, as amended June 7, 1914). "Article 6. Country was not created by military and U.S. flag and the United States were not brought to justice. Article VI and the flag of the Supreme Court it is for the clear that defendant and is the symbol of the United States of America. The United States of America is a nation with a government that reflects upon defendant and who is obligated to not only to wage war to defend a country and to do all the damage that has ruined the life of America. Country.

[illegible]

In a 3 page petition, including exhibit, dated June 13, 1975 to the members of the Pennsylvania Senate Judiciary Committee and to the National Association of State Catholic Conference, National Conference

ABC News, CBS News, NBC News, America and United Press, ingeniously performed a malicious continuous surveillance and defamation by continual distortion of the psychology of America's First President, and the resulting loss of morale among his cabinet led to a day-to-day loss of energy and ability to carry out his responsibilities. His cabinet and staff, which were composed of the intelligentsia of the 18th and 19th centuries, were ill-equipped to handle the demands of the industrial and modern world and the political conditions of the United States. U.S.C. 28 § 1332 - Diversity of Citizenship, and U.S.C. 28 § 1331 overtook and took away from the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Therefore, the motion to join ABC, CBS, NBC, AP and UPI as defendants must be granted.

[illegible]

The Complaint Regarding Defendant's Bad

Plaintiff Donald S. Crosby respectfully submits the following:

[illegible]

On March 31, 1977, a postmarked "Baltimore Review" dated March 31, 1977 was sent to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Exhibit #6 (changed dated July 28, 1977), #7 (changed dated August 30, 1977), #8 (changed dated July 7, 1977) and #9 (changed dated August 7, 1977) attached to the "Baltimore Review" are attacks by the Baltimore Exhibits #6, #7, #8 and #9 on the Court only. Also exhibiting are letters appearing in the National News, State news, and the Negro Newspapers, and many of the Immigrant papers and day. "Common sense over America. In any event, the world's "Baltimore Review" is against the judicial officers of both the United States of America and the "Baltimore Review" and many lawyers who are officers of the courts. They violate the Constitution by not judicially reviewing government or failed to pursue redress of grievances. One cannot possibly support the Constitution when one does not redress grievances under the Constitution. The Constitution is the U.S. Supreme Court, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, collectively amount to a complete violation of Article III of the Constitution by the U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives, and the members of the 50 State legislatures and all executive and judicial officers of both the United States and the 50 States of America. The complaint regarding the President and his cabinet was broken oath to God (under Article V of the Constitution): is treason. The Constitution.

for J. S. Steel's and United States' wrongs, perjury and ruin the life of Amadeo A. Stansby. — (Pope John Paul I arbitrarily took my case closed by his own means because, by inducing the excommunication of Catholic officials, he would have the U. S. Government & the misdeeds of the Church to pursue justice combine with "Protestantism" and lay off England under Amendment One, in association with other Amendments One rights.) To pursue the wrongs of perjury, Catholic "1", "2" and "3" made it obvious that they lay from Congress would drop criminal and no laymen in America would support legal counsel for Amadeo A. Stansby, (Alleged) as Catholic "13" was a copy of the "Call of Admission for lawyers support" 12 and proposed in London Catholic "12" are for the Court only. Under the oath, the lawyer must support the Constitution of the United States. The testimony of the oath reads as follows: "I will never reject from any consideration personal to myself, the cause of the defenseless or oppressed, or delay any man's cause for type or malice. So, He is the God. The oath was broken because Stansby was not kept with honest legal counsel. It was with "democracy as God" and "lawyers as mediators." For the reason, Pope Paul I and Pope John Paul II and the Vatican and the Catholic Church were obligated to secure honest legal counsel for Amadeo A. Stansby but failed to do so.

The truth of my case was likely to be suppressed by America's news media. However, on Christmas Day of 1974, someone who sounded like a friend of mine on Church services over the radio on Sunday, came on the major and spoke of Lynette as he brought up the sacred choir board man. (Believe me, I don't usually) speaking in "Bible" with fantastic claims, just afterwards, he had demands of "Lilithings" came on the radio to fall flat did not mention me. However, I don't know just a Lunatic and the despotic son named Donald and was in violation of the 9th Commandment of Confederation, and, in violation of "Abel and Eloper" law. Defendant is the sovereign ruler of "The universe and the macrocosmic" against the leaders and officials of the Church and Nation for they are wrongly, against wrong, which ruined the life of Donald S. Lunatic. As a consequence, Defendant is the only his sovereignty and He is before this Court to provide a sovereign remedy and a proper redress. Defendant, God does not do by law and order. Rule 55 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that if you do not make your appearance in this court, I will be by default and must meet the facts, all facts on the claim of need. I firmly believe I am worthy of the favors I ask of you at this time.

[illegible]

Claimed Relief regarding Defendants President Reagan, Vice President Bush, U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives. Plaintiffs demand that the federal government enforce its laws and regulations, and that the federal government take action to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the American people. Defendants must demonstrate that the federal government is not responsible for the actions of the defendants.



NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Washington, D.C. 20570

May 29, 1969

Re: Steelworkers, et al.
(Edgar Thomson Works, United
States Steel Corporation)
Case No. 6-CH-1669-8

Honorable Harold E. Hughes
United States Senate
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Hughes:

As Board Chairman Frank McDulloch advised you by letter of April 17, he has referred to me your inquiry concerning correspondence you received from Mr. Donald S. Drusky of Bradnock, Pennsylvania.

Drusky's dispute with the Steelworkers, giving rise to the numerous unfair labor practice charges which he has filed with the National Labor Relations Board, relates back to his employment with United States Steel's Edgar Thomson Works plant in 1963. While on layoff status during that year he attempted to obtain a job at another Company plant located in Clairton, Pennsylvania. His rejection because of a physical defect led to his unsuccessful effort to have Steelworkers Local 1219, and then the Clairton Local, 1257, process a grievance concerning the Company's action. In protest of the failure of these Locals to act in his behalf Drusky began picketing the Steelworkers' International headquarters in Pittsburgh on his days off. He offered to donate to the Children's Hospital \$2500 which he claimed was due him in lost wages if the Steelworkers would admit its financial responsibility to its members. In July 1966 he began full-time picketing of the offices of the Company and Union and, after several warnings, was suspended on August 1, 1966, for having been absent from work for a 27-day period. Following his suspension, Local 1219 urged him to return to work in order to improve his chances of filing a successful grievance. Drusky refused to return, and his suspension was converted to a discharge on August 8. Thereafter, Drusky rejected Local 1219's offer to file and process a grievance concerning his suspension and discharge, contending that his grievance was with the Union, and he continued his picketing of both the Company and the Union.

Re: Case No. 6-CH-1669-8

On January 23, 1967, Drusky filed the first of his charges (Case Nos. 6-CH-1621 and 6-CH-1626), alleging that the Company had discriminatorily discharged him on August 8, 1966, in violation of the National Labor Relations Act, and that such discharge had been caused by the Union. The Regional Director refused to issue a complaint, and Drusky appealed to this Office. After careful consideration I decided to sustain the Regional Director's determination, concluding that in view of all the circumstances, including the Union's forbearance in the face of Drusky's repeated picketing of its headquarters since 1965 and Local 1219's offer to represent him for the purpose of filing a grievance concerning his 1966 suspension and discharge, insufficient basis existed for a finding that the Union had caused his discharge. A further contention, that the Union had failed to process a grievance on his behalf in 1963, was deemed barred by the limitations provision to Section 10(b) of the Act which precludes the issuance of a complaint based on conduct occurring more than six months prior to the filing of a charge. With respect to Drusky's claim that the Company had suspended and discharged him because of his union activity, considering the record in its entirety, including the Company's tolerance of his picketing on his days off and the absence of any independent evidence of violations of the Act on the Company's part, I concluded that the burden could not be met of establishing that Drusky's suspension and discharge were for any reason other than his unprotected absence from work over a 27-day period without permission and despite repeated warnings.

On August 14, 1967, following denial of his appeal in the above cases, Drusky filed four charges (Case Nos. 6-CH-1631-1, 2, 3, 4), alleging that since his discharge on August 8, 1966, the Union had blacklisted him from further employment and that President Johnson, Pennsylvania Governor Shafer, State Secretary of Labor Hart, and the State Bureau of Employment Security had assisted the Union in this respect. These charges were dismissed and the appeal therefrom denied. It was concluded that there was an absence of evidence that the Union had interfered with his efforts to obtain employment and that the charges against the other named parties were completely groundless.

On April 3, 1968, Drusky filed a charge (Case No. 6-CH-4207) alleging that the Company had discriminatorily denied him March 4, 1968, request for reemployment. Following investigation, this charge was dismissed for insufficient evidence, and such dismissal was sustained on appeal.

Re: Case No. 6-CH-1669-8

On October 1, 1968, Drusky filed a charge (Case No. 6-CH-1583) alleging that the Union had failed properly to represent his following his discharge in 1966 and that it had failed, after Drusky complained of such treatment, to publish in its newspaper an account of his claim against it. This charge was also dismissed after investigation, and I denied the appeal on the grounds that the Union's failure or refusal to publish in its newspaper an account of Drusky's claim against it satisfactory to him could not be deemed to constitute a violation of any provision of the Act, and that the allegation that the Union two years earlier had failed properly to represent him was barred by the six-month limitations provision to Section 10(b).

Most recently Drusky filed 91 charges (Case Nos. 6-CH-1601-1-2, 6-CH-1603-1 to -49, 6-CH-4551-1 to -4, and 6-CH-1669-2 to -16) in two separate sets between November 3, 1968, and April 7, 1969, alleging in substance that various Local, District and International Union officials had improperly refused or failed to process his original grievance of 1963, that they thereafter conspired among themselves and with individuals from several private and public organizations to prevent Drusky's reinstatement by the Company and to obstruct his efforts to obtain redress from the Union either for its failure to process his grievance in 1963 or for causing his discharge in 1966 and preventing his reinstatement thereafter, and that they and other officials had failed to represent other members of the Union fairly and had caused many of them to be fired. The Regional Director dismissed all these charges, and I have denied the appeals on the grounds that the charges were alleged to be based on action not within the purview of the Act, were barred by the aforesaid limitations provision, named as respondents individuals who were neither employers, labor organizations nor agents thereof within the meaning of the Act, or were patently lacking in factual merit. With regard to the charge in Case No. 6-CH-1648 specifically, apart from the absence of any evidence to support the sweeping allegation that former Union president David McDonald had caused 25,000 workers to be illegally discharged during his term of office, further proceedings were barred by Section 10(b) of the Act, since McDonald left office in 1965.

I trust this reply fully answers your inquiry. If I can be of further service in this matter, please let me know. The correspondence sent with your inquiry is returned.

Sincerely yours,

Arnold Ordman
Arnold Ordman
General Counsel

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

REGION 6

1536 Federal Building, 1000 Liberty Avenue

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Telephone 644-9977

June 3, 1969

Mr. Donald S. Drusky
600 Talbot Avenue
Bradnock, Pennsylvania 15104

Dear Mr. Drusky:

Between January 23, 1967 and April 7, 1968 you have filed 116 unfair labor practice charges with this office. As you know, each of these charges has been repeatedly dismissed by me and my decision in each has been sustained upon appeal to the General Counsel in Washington. Nevertheless, you have continued to file numerous charges which essentially involve the same subject matter and which are either barred by the statute of limitations in Section 10(b) of the Labor Management Relations Act; or fail to state a cause of action; or name as respondents individuals who are neither employers, labor organizations, nor agents thereof; or which are patently lacking in factual merit.

Recently, on May 5, 1969 you filed an additional 19 unfair labor practice charges which, after careful consideration, were dismissed by me. As in the past, and in accordance with our procedures, you have been notified of your right to appeal my decision to the General Counsel. These 19 recent charges, together with the 116 charges dismissed above, make a total of 135 charges filed by you since January 23, 1967. The processing of these charges, including their receipt, acknowledgment, docketing, and filing has consumed a substantial amount of clerical manpower, time and effort. Furthermore, the investigation, review and consideration of these charges have resulted in the expenditure of an excessive amount of professional time, including my own, in determining the appropriate disposition of each charge. Finally, it should be pointed out that the professional and clerical time expended by the Regional Office staff has been duplicated by the General Counsel's Office of Appeals in Washington which has considered all of your appeals and has prepared lengthy and detailed reports upon responding to numerous inquiries made on your behalf.

Mr. Donald S. Drusky 2. June 3, 1969

In view of the foregoing, including the expense to the Government and the interference with the orderly processing of its normal workload, it is my conclusion that your continued filing of baseless charges relating to the same subject matter previously determined to be without merit, constitutes an abuse of the Board's processes and an undue harassment of respondents who must be served with copies of your charges and may be required to respond to them. Accordingly, you are hereby advised that I will no longer docket or process an unfair labor practice charge filed by you unless the charge is in fact timely and presents at least a prima facie case and I am satisfied that the filing of such a charge does not constitute a further abuse of the processes of this Agency.

Very truly yours,

Henry Shere
Henry Shere
Regional Director

Certified Mail
Return Receipt Requested

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

REGION 6

1536 Federal Building, 1000 Liberty Avenue

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Telephone (412) 644-9977

April 1, 1971

- 2 -

- 3 -

To President Jimmy Carter, Vice President Walter Mondale, Republican National Committee, Democratic National Committee, Pennsylvania Governor Richard Thornburgh, Pennsylvania State Governor William H. Scriffling III, and Pope John Paul II, and to ABC News, CBS News, NBC News, Associated Press, and United Press:

My petitions, signed and posted a special "Nobly Court" during the months of July, August, September and October to President Carter, Vice President Mondale, Governor Thornburgh, and Governor Scriffling, the Republican and Democratic National Committees and Pope John Paul II have been ignored. The petitions contained many signed documents, which outlined great criminal acts and corruption by U.S. Steel and United Steelworkers and others. My petitions also outlined various picket signs I used while picketing in Pittsburgh. I had begun picketing the United Steelworkers Headquarters in Pittsburgh on August 10, 1965. On August 9, 1966, I was fired by U.S. Steel while I was picketing the headquarters of the United Steelworkers of America for \$2500. That the union owes me which I will donate to Children's Hospital. Since the time of picketing, I have had a great many different picket signs that I used while picketing. Beginning on July 7, 1966, I picketed with the 4 placards listed below.

Placard #1: U.S. Steel and the Steelworkers conspired with the justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, eleven U.S. Circuit Courts of Appeals and 93 District Courts of the United States to deny me in order to obstruct justice and award me out of a multimillion dollar compensatory and punitive damage award and to prevent imprisonment for their crimes.

Placard #2: U.S. Steel and the Steelworkers failed to back me up picketing the Democratic or Republican campaigns of 1972 to get a snow job. In exchange, they would have provided the lucky Democrats & Republicans with money for the election campaign.

Placard #3: Carter, Mondale & Congress: We have a mandatory duty to redress that picketer against us America's People: We are still the boys in this country and you must respect our wish to promptly redress his grievances.

Placard #4: Carter, Mondale & Congress: How long have the picketed Steelworkers been playing politics and giving "Roses in America's Courts?"
U.S. Supreme Court: About 40 years

Placard #5 was supplanted with a new sign on November 10, 1980. The new sign is now designated as Placard #5 and below.

Placard #5: ABC News, CBS News, NBC News, Associated Press and United Press: Congress does not redress grievances and we are not going to picket grievances to put the heat on Congress to redress grievances.

Visit you stands, U.S. Steel and United Steelworkers control and dictate how govern all federal and state courts, agencies and departments while the federal and state governments redress no grievances from the corporations and politics of U.S. Steel and the United Steelworkers. The matter is further compounded because America's news media is not making the responsibility of good journalism.

The purpose of the news media, in the first place, was to inform the public of the misconduct of public officials. But, instead, the news media is covering up for the government as the misrepresentation of grievances is of the greatest magnitude of general misconduct by all public officials in America as a whole.

The declaration of independence in July 7, 1776 and the Revolutionary War resulted over the fact that King George III in England would not redress the colonial grievances. In the words, "picketing is King George III for redress of grievances were to no avail. Similarly, my petitions to all the King's Men in Washington were also to no avail. However, my Amendment One right of the U.S. Constitution guarantees my right to petition the government for redress of grievances, which must be promptly and properly acted upon by Federal officials in Washington, D.C. Neither prompt or proper action was taken by the government in Washington. Instead of the government acting lawfully, the government has been acting unlawfully. It should be obvious that U.S. Steel and the United Steelworkers know that the government does not redress grievances so they arbitrarily do as they wish and fix everything retroactively.

I am innocent and suffering a disabling injustice and my former experiences would be an experience before for "Miles" in "Miles" to go through. The world's best government is bearing my hardships as I have picketed in Pittsburgh for justice since the illegal discharge of August 8, 1966, by U.S. Steel.

My original case against the Steelworkers' union, involved over the fact the union was not properly representing the grievances of the union members which I sought to correct by offering the \$2500 redress & was entitled to form the union to Children's Hospital. While seeking to have the grievances of the members of the Steelworkers union properly represented, if some to my attention that the grievances of the people of the United States of America are also not being properly represented and redressed. It has been quite obvious all along that my grievances are not properly redressed. As a great bearing on the proper redress of the grievances of every citizen of the United States. In general, I want the union members grievances to be properly represented and redressed and I also want the government to properly represent and redress the grievances of any aggrieved citizen in America.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DONALD S. DRUSKY,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE JUDGES OF THE SUPREME COURT,
ELEVEN U.S. CIRCUIT COURTS OF
APPEALS AND EIGHTY-NINE U.S. DISTRICT
COURT EMBRACING THE FIFTY STATES
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND THE
UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION,
AND I. W. ABEL, JOSEPH MOLONY AND
WALTER BURKE OF THE UNITED STEEL-
WORKERS OF AMERICA, AND THE NATIONAL
LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,

Civil Action

No. 71 249

Defendants.

OPINION

Plaintiff has submitted to the Court in forma pauperis a Complaint charging defendants with conspiracy to deprive him of rights under the Constitution and laws of the United States. Invoked are the Civil Rights Statutes, 42 U.S.C.A. §§1981, 1983, 1985(2) and 1985(3). It is alleged that plaintiff was fired by defendant United States Steel Corporation for picketing in protest of the failure of the United Steelworkers of America to pay a sum of twenty-five hundred dollars to plaintiff, that the defendant National Labor Relations Board has erroneously refused to docket plaintiff's charge arising out of these circumstances, and that the various Judges of the Federal Courts have erroneously denied plaintiff's subsequent petitions concerning the same

factual allegations. The basic factual allegations are not unknown to this Court, for plaintiff has previously and unsuccessfully sought relief at Civil Actions 60-124 and 70-160, based upon substantially similar allegations. The instant Complaint designates, in essence, the same defendants previously sued with the exception that plaintiff has now added as defendants virtually the entire Federal judiciary.

For a multitude of reasons, the Complaint falls far short of what is necessary to state a cause of action under the Civil Rights Acts. To sustain a cause of action under the Civil Rights Acts, it must be alleged that the asserted wrongs were committed under color of State law. *Collins v. Hardyman*, 341 U.S. 651, 658 (1951); *Buck v. Barloggs*, 277 F. Supp. 864, 869 (N.D. Ill. 1967). Nowhere in the instant Complaint are there to be found factual allegations indicating that any of the named defendants were acting under color of State law.

The allegation of conspiracy also is insufficient to sustain a cause of action under 42 U.S.C.A. §1985. It is not enough to use the bare word "conspiracy" without setting forth supporting facts which tend to show an unlawful agreement. *O'Hara v. Matly*, 255 F. Supp. 540, 542 (W. D. Mich. 1966). No supporting facts have been set forth in the instant Complaint to support the bare allegation of conspiracy among the named defendants. On its face, the conspiracy alleged is incredulous.

While the foregoing deficiencies in the Complaint are believed to be sufficient to warrant dismissal of the Complaint as to all defendants, additional deficiencies with

respect to the causes of action asserted against the particular defendants provide further grounds for dismissal as to these defendants.

Although the common law doctrine of official immunity may not enjoy recognition to its fullest extent in a suit under the Civil Rights Statutes, it is recognized that the immunity enjoyed by members of the judiciary has not been abrogated by these Statutes. *Bowers v. Heisel*, 361 F.2d 581, 586-87 (3d Cir. 1966); *Loebhart v. Hennelme*, 411 F.2d 455, 459-60 (3d Cir. 1969). Under the doctrine, a member of the judiciary is afforded immunity from liability under the Civil Rights Statutes for all acts which are not clearly outside his jurisdiction. *Bowers v. Heisel*, *supra*, p. 590. The instant Complaint fails to allege actions of defendant-members of the judiciary which were clearly outside their jurisdiction. In fact, the allegations of the Complaint suggest to the contrary. Accordingly, the doctrine of judicial immunity would bar relief against defendant-members of the judiciary.

Dismissal of the cause of action against the National Labor Relations Board is warranted apart from the failure of the Complaint to allege a sufficient conspiracy or action under color of State law. It is doubtful that the National Labor Relations Board could be regarded as a "person" within the meaning of the Civil Rights Statutes. See *Monroe v. Pape*, 365 U.S. 167 (1961) and *Olsen v. California Adult Authority*, 423 F.2d 1326 (9th Cir. 1970). Moreover, the means of obtaining redress from alleged errors of the National Labor Relations Board. See *Schutte v. International Alliance*,

Etc., 188
Labor Rel
1966).

assert fed
States St
Steel Wor
Civil Rig
alleged,
of action
ciples o
judgments
defendant
National
here.

Complain
process v
I neverth
as to wat
§1915; D

that les
hereby d

cc: Don
8000
Bre

CEBET-AA

Form Approved Budget Bureau No. 64-1003-112		UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD CHARGE AGAINST [REDACTED] ORGANIZATION OR ITS AGENTS		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE Case No. _____ Date Filed _____	
INSTRUCTIONS: File an original and 3 copies of this charge and an additional copy for each organization, each local and each individual named in item 1 with the NLRB regional director for the region in which the alleged unfair labor practice occurred or is occurring.					
1. Name <u>Ph United States Senate and House of Representatives</u> <u>Washington, D.C.</u>		2. Organization or its agents against which charge is brought <u>Ph United States Senate and House of Representatives</u>		3. Representative to Contact _____ c. Phone No. _____	
d. Address (Street, city, State and ZIP code) <u>Washington, D.C.</u>					
e. The above-named organization(s) or its agents has (have) engaged in and is (are) engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8 (b), subsection(s) _____ (List Subsections) _____ of the National Labor Relations Act, and these unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of the Act.					
2. Basis of the Charge (Be specific as to facts, names, addresses, plants involved, dates, places, etc.) <u>By now all members of Congress know that David Mc Donalde had caused 25,000 workers to be illegally fired. While he was President of the United States many of America. The workers got off a occurred with the help of union officials at the local level.</u> <u>When an employee member express himself to be fired for engaging in union activities then the union officials who engage in, causing the employee member to be fired should be fired in only as a punishment to the union. The employee member should be reinstated with back pay and the union officials responsible for the large scale firing at the same time be fired by the company. This will stop illegal firing to pay the least cut down the number of illegal firings as the union officials responsible should be exposed to some risk rather than just punishment to the employee member.</u> <u>The Congress of the United States of America failed to enact corrective legislation long ago by not causing the discharge of union officials who caused discharge of employee member which resulted in unfair labor practices to continue and rather a named and the 25,000 title says that David Mc Donalde is connected with so independent employee.</u>					
f. Congress of the United States of America failed to enact corrective legislation long ago by not causing the discharge of union officials who caused discharge of employee member which resulted in unfair labor practices to continue and rather a named and the 25,000 title says that David Mc Donalde is connected with so independent employee.					
3. Name of Employer <u>United States Steel Corporation</u>		4. Location of Plant Involved (Street, city, State and ZIP code) <u>Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219</u>		7. No. of Workers Employed _____	
5. Type of Establishment (Factory, mine, wholesaler, etc.) _____		6. Identify Principal Product or Service _____		7. No. of Workers Employed _____	
8. Full Name of Party Filing Charge <u>Donald S. Drusky</u>					
9. Address of Party Filing Charge (Street, city, State and ZIP code) <u>800 Pittston, Bradent, Pa. 15104</u>					
10. Telephone No. <u>351-2435</u>					
11. DECLARATION					
I declare that I have read the above charge and that the statements therein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.					
By <u>Donald S. Drusky</u> (Signature of representative or person making charge)		(Title or office, if any) _____		By <u>March 3, 1972</u> (Date)	
Address _____		(Telephone number) _____		(Date)	
FULLY FALSE STATEMENTS ON THIS CHARGE CAN BE PUNISHED BY FINE AND IMPRISONMENT (U.S. CODE, TITLE 18, SECTION 1001)					

[illegible][illegible]

1. R. M. Ables, Walter Burke, Joe Maloney (in their capacity as officers of Delta Sigma Theta, Inc.)
2. Stenographer of America, AFL-CIO
3. Stenographer, NY-CIO, at St. Louis, Mo. b-6-CO-1583
4. Edgar Thompson Hoyle, b-6-CO-1583
5. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
6. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
7. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
8. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
9. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
10. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
11. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
12. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
13. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
14. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
15. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
16. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
17. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
18. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
19. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
20. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
21. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
22. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
23. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
24. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
25. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
26. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
27. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
28. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
29. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
30. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
31. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
32. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
33. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
34. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
35. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
36. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
37. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
38. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
39. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
40. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
41. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
42. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
43. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
44. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
45. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
46. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
47. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
48. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
49. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
50. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
51. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
52. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
53. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
54. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
55. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
56. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
57. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
58. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
59. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
60. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
61. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
62. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
63. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
64. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
65. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
66. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
67. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
68. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
69. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
70. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
71. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
72. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
73. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
74. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
75. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
76. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
77. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
78. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
79. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
80. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
81. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
82. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
83. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
84. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
85. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
86. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
87. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
88. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
89. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
90. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
91. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
92. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
93. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
94. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
95. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
96. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
97. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
98. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
99. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583
100. C. H. Ables, b-6-CO-1583

equality. If I am to be of further
benefit to you,

20. 1994-04-20 10:00:00
 21. 1994-04-20 10:00:00
 22. 1994-04-20 10:00:00
 23. 1994-04-20 10:00:00
 24. 1994-04-20 10:00:00
 25. 1994-04-20 10:00:00
 26. 1994-04-20 10:00:00
 27. 1994-04-20 10:00:00
 28. 1994-04-20 10:00:00
 29. 1994-04-20 10:00:00
 30. 1994-04-20 10:00:00

(b) (7)(C) - Confidential
 (b) (7)(D) - Excluded from automatic
 downgrading and
 declassification
 (b) (7)(F) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(G) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(H) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(I) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(J) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(K) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(L) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(M) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(N) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(O) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(P) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(Q) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(R) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(S) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(T) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(U) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(V) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(W) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(X) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(Y) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification
 (b) (7)(Z) - Excluded from automatic
 declassification

[illegible]

Dear Senator Kennedy:
Washington, D. C.
United States Senate
Honorable Edward M. Kennedy
1
Dear Senator Kennedy:
I, R. Abel, Walter Burke, Joe Molony
(in their capacity as officers of Delta
Epsilon Chapter of Omicron Psi)
Comm No. 6-C-1593
Springhouse, AFL-CIO, et al.
(Last Thomas White-2
Comm No. 6-C-1601-1 to -49

In the Eighty-Eight U.S. District Courts of the Fifty States of the United States of America

Donald S. Drusky, Petitioner.
The People of the Fifty States
of the United States of America,
Plaintiffs,

v.

The 100th U.S. Congress thru 105th
Congress and the Governor, Lt.
Governor and Legislature of the
Fifty States,
Defendants.

Affidavit in Forma Pauperis

With six additional sections
incorporated herein by reference.

I, Donald S. Drusky, depose and say that I am the Petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding; that I am unable to pay the costs of said proceeding or to give security therefor; that I believe I am entitled to redress; and that the nature of my petition is briefly stated as follows: There are seven sections to the petition that seek in sequence; 1. the removal of various elected public officials from office; 2. criminal complaint against the USX Corporation and the United Steelworkers of America; 3. criminal complaint against various public officials; 4. mandamus against various U.S. Attorneys; 5. mandamus against the Federal Communications Commission; 6. asks the Sovereign People of America to amend the U.S. Constitution and all the Constitutions covering the 50 States; 7. Donald S. Drusky seeks a divine redress from Defendant God.

In further support of this affidavit in forma pauperis, I have payments past due at the following:

1. Chase Manhattan Bank Visa Account Number: 4226 6100 0117 3620. By letter dated 1-26-99, Chase temporarily suspended credit privileges.
2. Sears Card Account Number: 0174049 189627. Between Billing Date of Oct. 19, 1998 thru Billing Date of Nov. 1998, as a penalty, the available credit was reduced from \$1074 to \$155. It is now \$41.
3. Cherry Chase Bank Visa Account Number: 4246 1710 1220 2862. By letter dated January 13, 1999, charging privileges have been temporarily suspended.
4. The Associates Loan Account Number: 01376800-0514890. Pressing real hard for at least a \$67 payment by phone, which I could not pay as I needed the money to finance cost of petitions for 88 U.S. District Courts.
5. First USQ Bank (Bank One) BP Visa Account Number: 4266 5036 0838 8975. Charge privileges have been revoked by letter dated January 13, 1999, and by monthly statement.
6. The Associates Limited Edition Visa Account Number: 4261 2007 1153 8618.
7. National City Bank of PA Visa Account Number: 4316 4075 1300 5999. Returned cut credit card as requested by monthly statement with closing date of 1-20-99.
8. Discover Financial Services Card Account Number: 6011 0021 6952 8478. Upon their letter dated January 23, 1999, it became necessary for me to return my Discover Card. By letter dated Jan. 29, 1999, Discover sought the immediate payment of the full balance of \$5,569.94.

In further support of this affidavit in forma pauperis, I have been unemployed and disabled since the August 8, 1966 discharge by U.S. Steel (now the USX Corp.). I presently receive \$777 Social Security Benefit by Direct Deposit at Dollar Bank of Pittsburgh. I do not own any real estate, stocks, bonds, notes, automobiles or other valuable property. I have ordinary household furnishings and clothing, which also include television sets, VCR, stereo components, model train collection, stereo record and compact disc collection, and Christmas ornaments and decorations, which may be used as security toward the above-entitled proceeding.

I declare under penalties of perjury that the foregoing affidavit is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

This 5th day of February 1999.
Donald S. Drusky

CLERK'S OFFICE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20001

CO-946●
Rev. 10/86

Donald S. Drusky
422 Chicora St.
East McKeesport, PA 15035

Date August 24, 1987

Dear: Mr. Drusky,

The enclosed new case is returned because the Court has directed the Clerk not to accept for filing any document which does not conform to the requirements of the Rules of this Court or of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The reason for the return is:

_____ JS 44 Cover Sheet not included.

_____ Summons for each defendant not included.

_____ Filing Fee not included.

_____ The word "Complaint" alone is insufficient; it must be "Complaint for....."

_____ Party(ies) full name, residence address and phone number not shown on complaint as required by Local Rule 106(d).

_____ Attorney's full name, address or phone number not shown on complaint as required by Local Rule 106(d).

_____ Complaint filed by out-of-town counsel not signed by member of our Bar as required by Local Rule 104(c).

_____ Copy of Complaint not supplied for the Court as required by Local Rule 106(c).

_____ Complaint not on paper 8½ by 11 inches long as required by Local Rule 106(e) effective January 1, 1983.

Other: Please refer to the enclosed materials for the proper format to use when writing a COMPLAINT. Also enclosed is an APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS for use if you wish to proceed without prepayment of costs.

JAMES P. DAVEY, CLERK OF COURT

By _____


Deputy Clerk
A.J. Rambow